

Tab 5

ington Post

E23

**JACK ANDERSON****Interior Aide  
Shoots Down  
Film on Lead**

Like Soviet historians who rewrite the past every time the Kremlin's political wind shifts, officials of the Interior Department have been trying desperately to eradicate all trace of a documentary film produced during the Carter administration.

Fish and Wildlife Service employees were ordered to turn in all copies of the film and sign statements attesting that they had complied with the confiscation decree. An environmental group was accused wrongly of stealing a copy.

Why all the uproar? Technically, I guess you could call the documentary film "explosive." It dealt with the kind of shotgun pellets used by the nation's nimrods.

There are two kinds of shot on the market—lead and steel. Most hunters prefer lead shot. They say it goes farther and truer, and doesn't chew up their gun barrels as steel shot does. But conservationists—including many hunters—say there's a serious problem with lead shot. It pollutes the environment.

Most of the pellets shot into the air miss the ducks or geese. Unlike Longfellow's arrow, they fall to earth we know just where—in marshlands,

where the waterfowl feed. Some are ingested with the birds' food. If the pellets are lead, the game birds can die. Thousands reportedly have died of lead poisoning.

In hopes of weaning hunters away from lead shot, the Fish and Wildlife Service assigned a ballistics expert to make a movie showing that steel shot—which doesn't poison waterfowl—is just as good as lead.

The little movie was produced by an Oregon firm, Dan Biggs Productions, at a cost to the taxpayers of \$28,500. But by the time it was completed, G. Ray Arnett, a Reagan appointee, was the Interior Department official who oversees the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Arnett is an enthusiastic hunter. Sources told my associate Vicki Warren he's a traditionalist—a lead-shot man. Arnett would not answer questions on the subject.

The confiscation order was issued. But the film hunters learned they had missed one copy of the film. The National Wildlife Federation had it.

A Fish and Wildlife minion was sent to retrieve the film. He accused the environmental group of stealing it, but the federation produced a bill of sale from the producer.

Meanwhile, the ballistics expert lost his job in a reduction-in-force. He's now pushing steel shot through the Wildlife Federation and other environmental groups.

**Pie in the Sky:** The love affair between President Reagan and cor-

porate America is an open secret. Now he wants to turn over the weather to the big corporations.

Specifically, he is considering a plan to deliver the government's land- and weather-satellite systems to commercial firms. The excuse is that this would cut down on the public funds that are now spent putting the information-gathering satellites up into space.

Unfortunately, it's not at all clear whether the government would wind up paying the private satellite operators more for the information it wants than it now spends to run its own satellites. And because the issue hasn't exactly caught fire on Capitol Hill, no definitive cost comparisons have been made.

One of the few members of Congress who has taken an active interest in the scheme is Rep. James H. Scheuer (D-N.Y.). "Currently these programs cost the taxpayer less than \$200 million per year," he told my reporter Carolyn Farrar. "The only serious proposal for transfer [to the private sector] would cost well over \$300 million per year."

Critics of the transfer plan have voiced concerns for national security. As a congressional aide put it, "Will the military trust private industry enough not to send up duplicate satellites?" Sen. Larry Pressler (R-S.D.) has sponsored legislation to require congressional approval before the government turns the satellite business over to private industry.

UNCLASSIFIED

Tab H

TALKING POINTS

Commercialization of LANDSAT and METSAT Programs

Continuing national security and efficacy concerns regarding the Department of Commerce approach and resolution of this issue exist:

- Secretary Baldrige, as Chairman of the Cabinet Council on Commerce and Trade (CCCT) will recommend transfer of both LANDSAT and METSAT by competitive bid even though Advisory Committees from both the private and government sectors have stated that:
  - There is a strong body of opinion that urges restraint and caution in proceeding with commercialization--there is no clear consensus as to the desirability or feasibility;
  - Creation of a single, Government-chartered subsidized firm would seem antithetical to the underlying economic philosophy of the US and this Administration;
  - A monopoly environment would cause a lack of vigor in the R&D effort and lack of incentive to adopt improvements which may materialize--which would be counter to the Administration's goal of space leadership;
  - Commercialization now could inhibit the free market process;
  - The market for land remote sensing data has not developed to a point where commercial viability could be demonstrated within the next ten years;
  - The most serious foreign competitors in the data market (France and Japan) will write off costs for operation, thus making it doubtful that a US commercial venture would be able to compete internationally without government support; and
  - There is considerable financial, policy, and program risk to the Federal Government in commercializing weather satellites with no clear policy or financial benefit to be realized.
- Notwithstanding the establishment of an interagency mechanism to deal with national security-related issues should commercialization be decided, we are still concerned about some aspects:
  - There are potential military and intelligence applications of current data products as demonstrated by CIA in renewable resource analysis and DIA in military applications; and

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

- LANDSAT and METSAT could provide foreign governments a photographic reconnaissance system for obtaining intelligence information from space. With possible systems improvements that might be proposed under private sector control, national security concerns would increase.
- Lastly, we are concerned that without clear gains, such as lessened Government involvement and reduced fiscal outlays (current indications are that if transfer occurs, Government expenditures will likely exceed the current \$200 million level), and resolution of tough national security issues, the transfer would be difficult to defend to Congress and the public.
- I recommend that we proceed with caution, that our analysis of the commercial proposals be thorough, and that all fiscal and national security implications be well documented and understood.

UNCLASSIFIED